

REMARKS

Claims 1-24 are pending in the application after this amendment.

Amendments of claims is not to be considered in any way an indication of applicant's position on the merits of the original claims. Incorporated herein (without repetition except as absolutely necessary) are the specific recitation of the facts and the specific arguments found in previous papers.

The Examiner maintains the rejections of claims 1-3, 6, 9-10, 12-13, and 21-23 under 35 USC §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,819,445 to Stevenson et al. (the "Stevenson reference"). The Examiner has rejected claims 4-5, 7-8, 11, 14-20, and 24 under 35 USC §103 as being unpatentable over the Stevenson reference, in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,498,656 to Matsie et al. (the "656 Matsie reference").

The Examiner used 35 USC Section 102(e) as the basis of the anticipation rejection because the Stevenson reference was filed before the filing date of the present application. As set forth in previous communications, although applicant can establish reduction to practice prior to the effective date of this reference and/or conception of the invention prior to the effective date of the reference coupled with appropriate due diligence the date to swear back this reference under 37 CFR 1.131, applicant believes that the present claims are distinguishable from the Stevenson reference. Although applicant will be distinguishing the present invention from the Stevenson reference in this amendment, applicant reserves the right to swear back this reference under 37 CFR 1.131.

All the independent claims currently pending in this application (claims 1, 2, 7, and 21) have been amended to include the step of "calculating a uniqueness identifier in a host computer" (emphasis added). There is significant language in the specification that describe this step. The following passage is from page 10, lines 8-16 of the originally submitted application:

"Further, depending on the application, specific configurations of the computer 20, printer 22, and the print

job 27, many types of uniqueness identifier algorithms could be used to calculate the uniqueness identifiers. Some exemplary algorithms that could be used to calculate uniqueness identifiers are those associated with checksums. For example, checksum algorithms like SUM8, SUM16, SUM32, CRC16, and CRC32. SUM8, SUM16, and SUM32 add up the total bytes in the print job or subportion using, respectively, an 8 bit, 16 bit, or 32 bit number. CRC16 and CRC32 use, respectively, a 16 bit or 32 bit polynomial to calculate the checksum. Encryption keys can also be used to create the uniqueness identifier."

Although applicant specifically disagrees with the characterization, it appears that the Examiner is equating the Stevenson name of the file which "may also include data such as the version number, file size, and last saved date of the file" with the claimed "uniqueness identifier." Appending one piece of known information to a second piece of known information is not equivalent to calculating.

Applicant would like to emphasize that the Stevenson optional secondary check is not related to the creation, generation, or calculation of the Stevenson name. Accordingly, although the Stevenson reference does mention that "some sort of checksum process" could be used as part of the optional secondary check, it is not relevant to applicant's claimed invention. Further, the Stevenson reference specifies that the checksum process would be "on the data of the newly-submitted file." This would exclude the possibility that the checksum process could be performed on the host computer because the "newly-submitted file" is, by definition, already at the printer.

Because none of the references teach or suggest the step of "calculating a uniqueness identifier in a host computer," applicant respectfully submits that the pending independent claims and the claims dependent thereon are allowable.

Applicant's claims 6 and 8 have been amended. The Examiner's previous rejection that column 4, lines 51-64 of the Stevenson reference "teaches an efficiency

Application No. 09/517,364  
Amendment dated August 22, 2005  
Reply to Office action of April 20, 2005

check because determining that the proper files is used improves the overall efficiency of the system" is moot in view of the added limitations. The Stevenson optional secondary check does not take into consideration any of the claimed factors. It appears that using the Stevenson process, if a previously rasterized is found in memory, it is retrieved and printed from recent memory without regards as to whether it is more efficient and without taking into consideration the claimed factors.

The Examiner also maintained his rejection of claims 4-5, 7-8, 11, 14-20, and 24 in which the Examiner combines the Stevenson reference with the '656 Matsie reference to show a method implemented for only parts of a print portion. Applicant specifically incorporates his previous specific recitation of the facts and the specific arguments. As neither of the references teach or suggest the amended claim limitation of "calculating a uniqueness identifier," these claims should be allowable for the reasons discussed above.

As the application is now in a condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to pass the application on promptly to issue.

Please charge Deposit Account No. 50-2115 for any additional fees which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,



Karen Dana Oster  
Reg. No. 37,621  
Of Attorneys of Record  
Tel: (503) 810-2560